

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

ARION COTINA JONES

VS.

LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE

§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL NO. 4:24-CV-1174-P

**ORDER RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL
AND RETURNING CASE TO DISTRICT JUDGE**

On December 2, 2024, *pro se* Plaintiff Arion Cotina Jones filed a complaint in the above-styled and numbered cause, and her Motion for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis was granted on December 12, 2024. In two separate orders issued on February 13, 2025, the Court ordered Plaintiff to, no later than February 27, 2025, comply with several local rules [doc. 9] and to provide an address for Defendant so that service could be completed by the United States Marshal or Deputy United States Marshal [doc. 10]¹. As of the date of this order, Plaintiff has wholly failed to comply with the Court's February 13, 2025 orders. Consequently, the Court **RECOMMENDS** that the above-styled and numbered case be **DISMISSED** for failing to comply with the Court's orders.

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT TO PROPOSED
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO OBJECT**

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), each party to this action has the right to serve and file specific written objections in the United States District Court to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation within fourteen (14) days after the party has been served with a copy of this document. The United States District Judge need only make a *de*

¹ In this order, the Court, citing Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m), stated: "If Plaintiff fails to comply with this Order, the Court will recommend dismissal of this case without further notice."

novo determination of those portions of the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation to which specific objection is timely made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Failure to file, by the date stated above, a specific written objection to a proposed factual finding or legal conclusion will bar a party, except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice, from attacking on appeal any such proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the United States District Judge. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428–29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded by statute on other grounds*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

ORDER

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636, it is hereby **ORDERED** that each party is granted **until March 17, 2025**, to serve and file written objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation. It is further **ORDERED** that if objections are filed and the opposing party chooses to file a response, the response shall be filed within seven (7) days of the filing date of the objections.

It is further **ORDERED** that the above-styled and numbered action, previously referred to the United States Magistrate Judge for findings, conclusions and recommendation, be and hereby is returned to the docket of the United States District Judge.

SIGNED March 3, 2025.



JEFFREY L. CURETON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE